

to remember was that the House passed a bill, and the Senate refused to pick it up back in October or November, I forget the time frame.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, if I might, Mr. Leader, what happened, as I recall, was Mr. NICKLES and Mrs. CLINTON agreed on a bill that was then passed overwhelmingly by the Senate in response to our bill and sent here. In fact, some 2½ months later we adopted a very similar piece of legislation, but only after people had gone off for 4 weeks their extended benefits.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I just remind the gentleman that our bill, the House bill, passed overwhelmingly by this House, and the Senate did pass their own bill, but our bills crossed in the night, and the Senate refused to take up our bill.

But be that as it may, the extensions are there, and certainly we are interested in taking suggestions from Members about how we would accomplish this in the shortest period of time. But I must tell the gentleman that the best way to take care of people that are unemployed is to find them a job, and, to do that, pass the job and economic growth package, the energy package, a transportation package and a pension security package.

All the economic development packages that this House has been in the lead on, it would be nice to get them through the other body and to the President so that jobs can be created and people can find a job, rather than have to rely on unemployment benefits.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observations. I certainly agree with him that in the long term the best solution is the creation of an economy that creates sufficient jobs for all Americans who are seeking jobs.

My friend knows that there are 6 million Americans who are unemployed at this point in time, the highest unemployment we have had in approximately a decade. It is nice to say that if we pass those bills, we will create new jobs, but the people who lose their unemployment at the end of this month and who will not have sufficient funds to pay their mortgages, to purchase groceries for their families, are going to have little solace because we are going to pass some bill that will create some jobs sometime down the road. But I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

Does the gentleman want to make an additional comment?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I am not an expert on unemployment insurance, but it is my understanding that the unemployment insurance program is still in place, and 26 weeks, every State in the Nation gets 26 weeks when they are let off.

I know the gentleman is referring to those that are running to the end of their benefits. I might point out to the gentleman that that is not 6 million people, and those extensions of benefits

are still in place for those that are still receiving benefits.

Having said that, there is time, if we can work out some sort of agreement, to do something for those that may have their benefits expiring. So there is time to work, and there are vehicles by which we could do it. But I hope the gentleman is not suggesting that we go beyond regular order in accomplishing passage of such legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I tell the leader, on this side of the aisle regular order is a concept which we support, but it will not be of help to people if we do not act, and by May 31, you indicate 6 million, I am saying 3 million. I am not sure whether it is Federal-State, about a million are at risk on the State program, or maybe 2 million on State and 1 million on Federal. There is a total of 3 million at risk.

I tell the leader that it is my understanding in each of the recessions in the early 1980s and in 1990, we extended the existing program's coverage for substantially more weeks than we have done in this recession.

With 6 million people unemployed, with jobs difficult to find for those 6 million people, and, as the gentleman knows, under the program you cannot receive benefits unless you are, in fact, looking for a job, I would say that it would be appropriate for us to do this in the regular order. Of course, a suspension bill is in the regular order. As a matter of fact, we are going to do a number of suspension bills next week.

The leader pointed out correctly that we passed unemployment extension through the House last year in the fall on a largely, not largely, but a large bipartisan vote, so I think that could be done. But I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would just yield further, I really do not want to tread in water that may get too deep for me, because, again, I am not an expert on this, but I understand in our looking through how we can accomplish what the gentleman may want or not want, it is my understanding that there is a significant amount of money left in the States at this moment, and that if the States themselves wanted to extend their unemployment benefits and it was in their best interests to do so, they could do it.

□ 1415

So I think it is a stretch to say that we are at a crisis point, that we have to move quickly and not deliberatively on this issue.

So we are looking at it. We are taking advice from Members. The Committee on Ways and Means is looking at opportunities to address this problem, and we will do it as soon as and as fast as we can.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observation. We may differ on the nature of a crisis, but my belief is that every family that faces its unemployment extension benefits ending on May

31 for themselves believes that is a crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 19, 2003

Mr. DELAY. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, May 19, 2003, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 16, 2003, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1950, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2004 AND 2005

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations have until midnight on Friday, May 16, 2003, to file a report on H.R. 1950, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1588, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet next week, the week of May 19, to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. The Committee on Armed Services ordered the bill reported yesterday, May 14, 2003, and is expected to file its report in the House tomorrow, May 16, 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy with a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312

of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 20. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, which will be available tomorrow for their review on the Web site of both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a bill called the Unborn Victims of Violence Act has come before this Congress, and it simply seeks to protect unborn children from those who would inflict violence upon them against the will of their mother.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans, there is nothing in this world that we love more than our children. Indeed, one of the great founding principles of this Nation is the God-given duty to protect the innocent and the oppressed and the helpless, especially while they are still little children. Yet we have made no statutory provision on the Federal level to protect unborn children from brutal acts of violence.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in spite of what the pro-abortion groups may say, this bill does not protect those unborn children that may be subjected to the violence of elective abortion. But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps if we can find the humanity to protect expectant mothers and even a few of those, our defenseless little brothers and sisters today, perhaps tomorrow we can find the compassion and the courage to protect them all.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MINI-NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to highlight a security issue that has been overlooked since September 11, 2001. That would be the number of nuclear weapons in the world today.

As I speak here on the floor of this House, the United States has 7,500 nuclear weapons deployed and ready for use. Their destructive power is equal to 80,000 Hiroshima-sized bombs. At the same time, Russia has more than 6,000 warheads scattered across Asia, some of them still on hair-trigger alert. I wonder if any are pointed at this building, this building that we are standing in right now.

Even India, Pakistan, and now North Korea have joined the nuclear club. These countries are motivated to obtain nuclear weapons for several reasons: security, global influence, and pride. These countries are motivated to obtain nuclear weapons because other countries have them or are trying to get them, including the United States. It is a Catch-22 with unthinkable consequences.

But make no mistake: every nuclear weapon built by any country on this Earth was built with money diverted from a school that should have been built, a hospital that should be saving lives, and food that should be feeding the poorest of the poor. The resources that human beings pour into weapons solely intended to facilitate their very own destruction is astonishing.

These weapons threaten not only individuals and nations, but the very existence of humankind. This is a threat that cannot be tolerated. This is the father of all weapons of mass destruction.

That is why I am so disappointed that the Bush administration supports funding research on so-called low-yield nuclear weapons. This is a terrible mistake. Even the so-called low-yield weapons planned by Pentagon bureaucrats will be almost as strong as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. These

low-yield weapons will spew radioactive dust miles into the atmosphere where it falls. It will spew dust of radioactive dust on mothers, babies, brothers and sisters, men and women, all of them innocent, all of them undeserving of a personal nuclear holocaust.

Nuclear weapons are humanity's biggest threat. Their greatest strength is that they corrupt human beings with misguided visions of power and security. We are fooling ourselves if we think more nuclear weapons means greater security and smaller nuclear weapons means guaranteed safety. These are the delusions that only lead closer to nuclear destruction.

Instead of researching the new nukes, we ought to be getting rid of the ones we have. That is why I will soon introduce the Nuclear Nonproliferation treaty, NPT, Commitments Act, which calls on the United States to live up to its commitments under the NPT to take immediate steps toward a nuclear weapons convention to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

I ask my colleagues to sign on to my bill, because our world will not be safe from nuclear destruction until we turn the tables on these horrific weapons and destroy them. In the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty which went into effect in 1972, the United States committed to work toward completely eliminating the world's stock of nuclear weapons.

The fact is that as long as these weapons exist, they will spread, bringing the threat of nuclear destruction to all. The only way to keep this from happening is to abolish nuclear weapons entirely and develop a strong, multilateral organization to prevent nuclear weapons from threatening the world ever again.

The Cold War is over; but, sadly, the threat from nuclear weapons has increased. Instead of wasting our resources building more weapons that can never be used and serve only to threaten the very existence of humankind, let us take the path away from nuclear war and toward a lasting peace for our children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MUSGRAVE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the